

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary of Office Action**

Claims 1-39 were pending in this case.

Claims 1-4, 15-22, and 33-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Matthews, III et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0139465 ("Matthews") in view of Shoff et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0015815 ("Shoff").

Claims 5-14 and 23-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Matthews in view of Shoff and further in view of Herz et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,758,257 ("Herz").

### **Summary of Applicants' Reply**

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 19 and added new claims 40-41 in order to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the originally-filed application. (See, e.g., applicants' specification at ¶¶ 106, 108, 122, and 125.)

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

### **Applicants' Reply**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 15-22, and 33-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Matthews in view of Shoff. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 19 to more clearly state that a search of at least one information database is performed over a public network. The data identified in the search includes search results obtained from the at least one information database.

Matthews is directed to an electronic programming guide (EPG) which visually correlates program titles to scheduled viewing times. A hyperlink browser resides in the memory, and one or more hyperlinks are integrated as part of the EPG user interface. The hyperlinks reference target resources containing interactive content related to the video programs, and are supplied with the program records received from the headend. (Matthews, Abstract, FIG. 2, and ¶ 69.)

Shoff is directed to an electronic programming guide (EPG) which determines if the present program being viewed is interactive. If the program is interactive, a target specification stored in

the EPG is used to activate a target resource containing supplemental content for enhancing the program (Shoff, Abstract).

The Examiner alleges that Matthews's and Shoff's teachings of searching the Internet for a server indicated by a hyperlink reads on searching a public network (Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully submit that applicants' amended claims 1 and 19 preclude such an interpretation. Matthews and Shoff teach a specific destination referenced by a hyperlink in a program guide. More specifically, the destination of the hyperlinks in Matthews and Shoff is a predetermined target, even if a request to connect to the target must be made. In contrast, applicants' amended claims 1 and 19 require searching an information database over a public network to identify relevant data. In particular, a search for content may be performed based on a user's particular interest.

In addition, applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify the teachings of Matthews or Shoff to arrive at the claimed invention. In particular, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify the system of Matthews or Shoff to download search results obtained from at least one searched information database, as required by applicants' claims 1 and 19. Since the destination referenced by each hyperlink of Mathews and Shoff is fully determined, following the hyperlink will not yield more than one result. In contrast, a search of an information database as required by applicants' amended claims 1 and 19 may yield multiple results of interest to the user.

Therefore, applicants' claims 1 and 19 are patentable over Matthews and Shoff, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 19 and claims 2-18 and 20-41, which depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 or 19, are patentable.

Application No. 09/810,324  
Amendment dated January 29, 2010  
After Final Office Action of April 15, 2009

Docket No.: ST-028 Cont 2

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are accordingly respectfully requested.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-1075, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Miranda J. Ha  
Miranda J. Ha  
Registration No.: 65,073  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant  
Customer No. 75563